A U M

"These sons belong to me; this wealth belongs to me": with such thoughts is a fool tormented. He himself does not belong to himself, much less sons and wealth.—*Buddhaghosha Parables.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXIX **December, 1940** **No. 2**

WORK FOR THEOSOPHY

THE Theosophical Movement finds expression in every effort to further true education and to promote practical brotherhood among men. Historically, this definition includes the various stages in the rise of liberal thought—the political and social reforms, the victories gained by science in its battle with theology for right of independent investigation, and all types of literature designed to break unthinking habits and prejudices of the race-mind. These movements, fathered by honest and courageous men, have each represented a degree of progress in the gradual awakening of the inner, spiritual man, seeking to cast off the fetters of intellectual slavery.

The leaders in these struggles for partial freedoms, however, were children of their age, inarticulate in formulating the deeper needs of all humanity and unaware of the true relation between the work they had undertaken and the larger objective toward which they were opening the way. But peering beyond these popular heroes of human progress, the visible performers on the stage of history, the Theosophical student is able to perceive the workers behind the scene; to see the hidden dimension of the Theosophical Movement and to recognize its leaders as Sages possessed of a universal view of human evolution through their knowledge of Reincarnation and Karma.

These two aspects of the one great evolutionary movement are necessarily interdependent, traversing parallel courses through history. Sages who represent Theosophy as a body of tested knowledge perceive the nature of the Movement as a whole, while the independent reformer in performing his necessary task *feels* rather than sees the true worth of his efforts to humanity. Martin Luther during the Reformation and Voltaire in the later "age of enlightenment" both participated in the necessary destruction of the Dark Age con-

straint on self-determination in religion and life. Neither Luther's fanaticism nor Voltaire's worldly agnosticism, though circumscribing their efforts, could stem the current toward freedom set in motion by their labors. In the soil prepared by such popular movements, the direct agents of the Theosophical Movement were able to plant the seeds of true education. Even the movements of iconoclasm alone have served the Theosophic cause, for after the pressure and prejudice of preconception have been removed, the natural expressions of soul-memory provide a pathway to the knowledge called Theosophy.

When free thought permitted diversity in religious and philosophical opinions to replace the false unity of dogma, it became possible for a great Theosophical teacher to synthesize discordant claims in the doctrines of ancient wisdom. The broad truths of Karma and Reincarnation, as presented by H. P. Blavatsky, offered a new outlook calling for revaluation of the old theories and beliefs. This great teacher realized that within the nature of each man lies an intuitional basis for the ethics of practical brotherhood, waiting for the Manasic support that only philosophy can provide. Lost links between the intuitive yearnings of the soul and a rational philosophy of life needed to be rediscovered, metaphysics to be cleansed of those theological formulations which marked the onset of the Black Age.

Practical work in furthering the interests of the Theosophical Movement is in itself educational endeavor in the widest and fullest sense. Wherever the Movement has existed, efforts have been made to *draw forth* from stultified minds the means of self-engendered thinking. Theosophical teachers have ever recognized that knowledge must be an internal construction rather than the result of external indoctrination. Theosophy has its germinal seeds in the intuitions of every man. Great Theosophical sages have sought, first, to offer principles of inner knowledge, and then to offer hypotheses which, worked out in practice, lead to a consistent philosophy of life.

Today, through the persistent efforts of theosophists, the subject of Reincarnation has come to have compelling interest for minds of every class. Both H. P. Blavatsky and W. Q. Judge placed careful emphasis on the need of realizing this essential idea of the Theosophical philosophy as a *working* hypothesis—a means of seeking knowledge in a new and more fruitful direction than that indicated by theological treatises and the discoveries of science. Theosophical students began their work of exploring the many implications of "Reincarnation and Karma" by referring to Theosophical teachings of the past, the body of knowledge which H. P. Blavatsky held forth as the hope of enlightenment. The field for immediate applications

of the philosophy was sought in practical associations of students. At this time also the twofold aspect of the Theosophical Movement was clearly represented. Developments in science, philosophy, and literature were pointing suggestively to the inherent reasonableness of Theosophy, while students began direct study of the Teaching.

The consummation of these diverse and co-operative activities must also proceed in a dual way—the approach of the modern climate of opinion to Theosophy and the illumination by Theosophical teaching of the fundamental issues of philosophy and science. Theosophists of today, having first assimilated to the best of their ability the synthesizing principles of the philosophy, may in some measure anticipate the probable meeting grounds between the knowledge they have found helpful and general developments in the mind of the race. The Theosophist who has a familiarity with the language and problems of modern thought—more particularly in biology, psychology, sociology—will be able to determine promising signs of the times, to "lend a hand" where suggestion or encouragement might be welcome. New and helpful recruits in the work of direct Theosophical promulgation may thus be found.

The Theosophical student makes no *personal* claim to knowledge. He is utilizing axioms and hypotheses which show every promise of rewarding his quest for certainty. The Theosophist of this interim cycle is acquiring the fundamentals of an education at the feet of the Wise Men of all ages. He hopes that through perseverance ways and means may open before him for personal verification of Theosophical doctrines, such as, for instance, the teaching of Reincarnation. The whole of the philosophy is but a natural and logical development from this idea, but in order to arrive at knowledge first-hand, the student must himself carry out the work of determining applications, constantly checking these with the conclusions of the Teachers.

As this verification proceeds, he approaches ever more closely to knowledge. And he follows the path of beings whose consistent labors in the service of their fellows attest that whatever their knowledge may be, it is worth striving for. *They* must be the means through which the final acquirement of knowledge is made. *They* are able to give instruction in the processes through which direct knowledge is attained and by which each aspirant may know for himself. But they can provide only the means of attainment, not the attainment itself, and this only in cases where individual preparation has been made. It is one task for all, a task for learning, and a task that can best be fulfilled by appreciation of the twofold path of the Theosophical Movement.

QUEEN OF THE SCIENCES

II

ALL mathematical roads lead back, eventually, to India—not to present-day India, which was already beginning to decay 5000 years ago, but to the prehistoric India which included such countries as Persia, Mongolia and Tibet, and other land now sleeping beneath the sea.

Western mathematicians are at last beginning to acknowledge their debt to India. It is now generally admitted that our numerical system, which for centuries was considered as an invention of the medieval Arabs, is of Indian origin. Louis C. Karpinski recently emphasized India's contribution to modern trigonometry by saying that "the Hindus, by a stroke of genius, dropped the Greek trigonometry of chords and introduced the half-chord or sine function. With the shadow function of the Hindus, further developed by the Arabs and Europeans, one has a trigonometry adaptable to simple mathematical formulations, as Viète demonstrated in so masterly a fashion."[1]

The mathematical standing of Bhaskara, who was born in 1114 and whose works have been accepted as standard authorities in India for the last eight centuries, is generally acknowledged. He was supposed to have been the first Indian mathematician to use negative numbers. But in 1938 Professor G. A. Miller discovered that Brahmagupta, who lived 500 years earlier, had indicated a negative number by placing a dot over it.[2]

In 1874 a text was published at Leyden bearing the title *Aryabhatiya* and attributed to the mathematician Aryabhata, who was born in 476 A. D.[3] This was considered to be the earliest Indian text bearing the name of an individual author, the earliest one dealing specifically with mathematics, and the earliest astronomical treatise from the so-called "scientific" period of Indian astronomy. The *Aryabhatiya* is divided into four sections, and is not a complete manual of mathematics, but rather a supplement to processes which, although not described, were evidently well known. It shows how, even at that comparatively late date, the Indian mind refused to make a line of demarcation between religion and science, as the author, before commencing the scientific portion of his work, first pays his

---

[1] *Science*, Feb. 17, 1939.

[2] *Science*, Oct. 21, 1938.

[3] *The Aryabhatiya of Aryabhata* (translated by Walter E. Clark).

reverence to "Brahman, who is One in Causality but many in His manifestations." Even Bhaskara, 600 years later, described the number 10 as being like "the Infinite invariable God who suffers no change when old worlds are destroyed or new ones created, when innumerable species of creatures are born or as many perish." After paying his reverence to Brahman at the beginning of every section, Aryabhata then proceeds with an outline of astronomy, a discussion of mathematics, a treatise on "the reckoning of time" and a dissertation on the qualities of the sphere.

Up to the present, our knowledge of Indian mathematics has been extremely limited, since no reliable history of the subject has been available. This is now being remedied by two Hindu mathematicians who are publishing a history of Indian mathematics in three volumes, only two of which have as yet appeared in America.[4] The authors give a comprehensive account of the development of the mathematical sciences in India from the earliest historical times up to the seventeenth century. Their material is drawn directly from the original Sanskrit texts, including many hitherto untranslated treatises, and their work forms an important and very necessary contribution to the history of mathematics. It is interesting to notice that even these modern Indian scientists follow the ancient traditions by dedicating their work "to the Seers, our Ancestors, the first Path-Makers."

They explain that in India conciseness of composition, especially in scientific matter, was highly prized, the tendency toward compactness increasing the further back one goes. For that reason Indian treatises on mathematics contain the briefest possible statements of known formulas and their results. This may be one of the reasons why Western mathematicians, who are accustomed to a large amount of explanatory verbiage, find the Indian treatises so abstruse.

Knowing that science and religion were never separated in the old days, the authors go back to the *Vedas* for the first historical references to mathematics, and show that fractions were known at the time the *Rig-Veda* was written. Although Max Müller placed the composition of the *Vedas* at about 1100 B. C., when humanity was in its "childhood,"[5] the Indian scholar Dyanand Sarasvati said that "the *Vedas* have now ceased to be objects of study for nearly 5000 years," and Krishna Shastri Godbole, in a scholarly article based upon astronomical data, proved that they had been known at least 25,000 years ago. Before they were recorded by some of the earliest Aryan Ini-

[4] *History of Indian Mathematics*, Bihutibhusan Datta and Avadhesh Narayan Singh (Lahore, 1935; 1938).

[5] Müller, *Introduction to the Science of Religion*, p. 278.

tiates, the *Vedas* were taught orally for thousands of years and then compiled on the shores of Lake Manasa-Sarovara in Tibet. This was before the Aryans came down into what we now call India. Dr. Whitehead, then, may not be so far wrong in his assumption that our numerals originally came from Tibet.[6]

Ganita, the Hindu word for arithmetic, occurs copiously in Vedic literature. Says the *Vedânga Jyatisa:* "As the crests on the heads of peacocks, as the gems on the heads of snakes, so is *Ganita* at the top of the sciences." *Bijaganita,* or algebra, can also be traced back to this early period, being at that time closely associated with geometry. The Great Altar (*Mahavedi*) of the obligatory Vedic rites was constructed along strictly geometrical lines.

The habit of using letters for numbers is traced back to Panini, who restored the classical Sanskrit and composed the most elaborate and scientific system of grammar ever known. These letter-numbers, however, were never used for buying and selling, but only for philosophical purposes. Was Plato aware of this fact when he suggested that numbers be studied "not in a common way, for the purpose of buying and selling . . . but for facility in the energies of the soul itself?"[7] Another link between Greece and India is found in the fact that Pythagoras, who studied in India, built his numerical system upon the "metrical speech" of the *Vedas.* The *Aitaraya Brahmana* proves the identity of the Pythagorean and Brahmanical systems beyond dispute. Sir Thomas Heath furnishes another link when he says that "the famous 'Theorem of Pythagoreas' seems not to have been his discovery but rather something which he learned in India. It is found in the *Apastamba-Sulba-Sutra,* and was known in the Brahmanical period (*Satapana Brahmana*) which is considered to belong to the 8th century B. C."[8] Even Galileo's paradox, *the part may have the power of the whole,* has been traced by another modern mathematician back to Bhaskara.[9]

The story of Krishna proves that mathematics was taught in India at least five thousand years ago. Krishna's education started at Ujjain with the Acharya Sandipani, who taught him "the *Vedas* with their subsidiaries, the art of writing, mathematics, music and medicine."[10] In Buddhist literature mathematics is regarded as the first and noblest of the arts.[11] Gautama the Buddha began his education at the age of eight, "firstly with writing and then with arithmetic as the most im-

---

[6] A. N. Whitehead, *Introduction to Mathematics,* p. 58.
[7] *Republic,* Book VII.
[8] *Heath,* History of Greek Mathematics.
[9] Dantzig, *Number, the Language of Science.*
[10] *Sabha,* ch. 54.
[11] *Vinaya Pitaka.*

portant of the 72 arts."[12] Sir Edwin Arnold, in his *Light of Asia,* minutely describes the extraordinary mathematical knowledge of this eight-year-old boy. In the *Arthashastra* of Kautilaya (400 B. C.) arithmetic is mentioned as one of the essentials of education. One of the four classifications of Jaina religious literature is "the exposition of the principles of mathematics."

The mathematical symbols found on the seals at Mohenjodaro (the date of which is still undetermined) show that the science was known even in that remote period. The Brahmana period, in which all branches of mathematics were known and practiced, was followed by 2000 years of brilliant achievement. After the twelfth century, in which Bhaskara appeared, little original work was done, mathematical writers confining themselves almost entirely to commentaries on the older texts.

After reading these interesting accounts of the developments of mathematics in India, one wishes that some historian had performed a similar service for ancient Egypt. All that we know of Egyptian mathematics at the present day comes from a few papyri: the Rhind, the Moscow, the Kahun fragments discovered by Flinders Petrie, the Berlin papyrus and the two wooden tablets now in the Cairo Museum.

The Rhind papyrus[13] was found in Thebes in the ruins of a small building near the Ramesseum. It was purchased in Luxor in 1858 by A. Henry Rhind and after his death passed to the British Museum. Originally a single roll 18 feet long and 13 inches wide, it now consists of two pieces separated by a gap. Some of the fragments taken from the gap are now in the possession of the New York Historical Society.

This papyrus, written in hieratic characters, is a copy of a still older document which its translators trace back to the twelfth dynasty (1849-1801 B. C.). It proves that the Egyptians were acquainted with the decimal system at that time and were proficient in geometry, being able to determine the areas of triangles, rectangles and circles as well as the volumes of prisms and cylinders. This papyrus also contains the earliest known record of an attempt to square the circle.[14]

The Galenischev papyrus, which is in the Museum of Fine Arts at Moscow, contains nineteen problems, some of which are new types of calculation unknown until now and therefore difficult to comprehend. Its translators, Messrs. Touraiev and Struve, discovered that certain

---

[12] *Antagada-dasao.*
[13] *The Rhind Papyrus,* Eric C. Peet; *The Rhind Papyrus,* A. B. Chace.
[14] R. W. Sloley, *Ancient Egypt,* 1922.

problems hitherto attributed to Archimedes had been solved long before by the Egyptians.

It is now generally admitted that the Greeks obtained their knowledge of mathematics from the Egyptians. Thales, the first Greek mathematician of historical times, "went first to Egypt and from there introduced the study of mathematics," as Proclus wrote. Pythagoras spent twenty-two years in Egypt and Plato studied in the University of Heliopolis for thirteen years. In 1917 Karpinski stated that the material then available indicated a high state of mathematical thought in Egypt long before the Golden Age of Greece. Twelve years later he expressed his opinion that "the indebtedness to Egypt explicitly affirmed by Greek writers is no figure of speech, but an assured fact."[15]

The relics exhumed by Mariette-Bey show that long before Greece came into existence the arts and sciences of the Egyptians were ripe and old. They had clocks and dials to measure time. Their cubit was the established unit of linear measure. They understood land-measuring, an art based upon geometry, and were proficient in algebra. Breasted speaks of their method of laying nilometers around the innumerable bends in the river for a distance of 700 miles, so that the zero points, always below water, remained on one plane.[16] Sloley admits that from the first dynasty on, the Egyptians were using the decimal system, involving numbers running up into millions..[17] This is another proof that India was the birthplace of this system of numeration, since Menes was none other than Manu-Vina, who migrated from India to Egypt, bringing with him the culture of his mother land.[18] Piazzi Smyth declared that the geometrical knowledge of the pyramid builders began where Euclid's ended. The time when they lived may be roughly estimated from a statement found in one of the books of Hermes, which describes the pyramids as standing upon the seashore, implying that their erection antedated the upheaval of the Sahara. The Egyptians themselves declared that mathematics was known in their land in the days of Isis, Osiris and the second Hermes. As they lived before the Denderah Zodiac was painted upon the walls of that Temple (which was over 75,000 years ago) we can get some idea of the length of time that mathematics has been known in that ancient land.

The gradual deciphering of the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions is also adding to our knowledge of ancient mathematics. One tablet, now in the Ottoman Museum at Constantinople, shows that the

---

[15] *Science*, Dec. 27, 1929.
[16] *Scientific Monthly*, 1920.
[17] *Ancient Egypt*, 1922.
[18] *History of India*, Collouca-Batta.

Babylonians were acquainted with geometry and had visualized Thales' proposition concerning the angle in a semicircle long before the Greek mathematician was born.[19] A recently translated treatise, which lay unread in the Yale University Babylonian collection for twenty-five years, establishes the fact that the Babylonians were familiar with the Pythagorean Theorem and understood quadratic and even higher degree equations.

Even the Babylonian mathematical road leads back to India, since Babylonia happened to be situated on the way of the earliest Hindu emigration, allowing it to be benefitted thereby. Professor David E. Smith of Columbia University recently admitted this fact by saying, "So far as we can now see the solution of the quadratic equation is due to the Assyrians, Sumerians and Babylonians. But the relation of the Sumerians to the early Hindu civilization would lead us to believe that the first knowledge of this equation is far more remote than the Hindu literature reveals."[20]

Although the Egyptian and Babylonian records prove the mathematical knowledge of these ancient nations without a doubt, they still give us no indication that *higher* forms of mathematics were taught in the Mystery Schools of those lands. Modern mathematicians, however, are beginning to suspect that such was the case. "It seems evident," says Professor Smith, "that the Temple Schools of Nineveh and Babylon developed a science of mathematics, especially the branch we now call algebra." Kurt Vogel goes further, observing:

> The problem of the truncated Pyramid, the most remarkable problem of Egyptian mathematics yet known to us, goes so far beyond what we otherwise know of Egyptian geometry in that period that we are tempted to ask whether there may not have existed side by side with the practical geometry of everyday life *an esoteric geometry which was the secret property of the priests.*[21]

Even Professor Sayce, commenting upon the Babylonian inscriptions, was forced to admit that "many of the ancient texts were so written as to be intelligible only to the initiated; but the initiated were provided with keys and glosses."[22]

The Secret Doctrine informs us that there *are* keys which will unlock the innermost meaning of those ancient texts, and that some of those keys are mathematical. The modern mathematician and archaeologist, however, need not hope to find those keys, since they are carefully preserved in inaccessible places and as carefully hidden from prying eyes. As H. P. B. says,

---

[19] *Science*, Jan. 13, 1930. R. C. Archibald. [20] *American Mathematical Monthly*, October, 1938.
[21] *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 1930. [22] *The Ancient Babylonians*, Introduction.

It is maintained that India (not in its present limits, but including its ancient boundaries) is the only country in the world which still has among her sons adepts, who have the knowledge of all the seven sub-systems and the key to the entire system. Since the fall of Memphis, Egypt began to lose those keys one by one, and Chaldea had preserved only three in the days of Berosus. As for the Hebrews . . . they never had the higher keys.[23]

WAKING TIME OF SOUL

Surely it is not a melancholy conceit to think we are all asleep in this World, and that the conceits of this life are as mere dreams to those of the next; as the Phantasms of the night, to the conceits of the day. There is an equal delusion in both, and the one doth but seem to be the emblem or picture of the other: we are somewhat more than ourselves in our sleeps, and the slumber of the body seems to be but the waking of the soul. It is the ligation of sense, but the liberty of reason; and our waking conceptions do not match the Fancies of our sleeps. At my Nativity my Ascendant was the watery sign of Scorpius; I was born in the Planetary hour of Saturn, and I think I have a piece of that Leaden Planet in me. I am no way facetious, nor disposed for the mirth and galliardize of company; yet in one dream I can compose a whole Comedy, behold the action, apprehend the jests, and laugh myself awake at the conceits thereof. Were my memory as faithful as my reason is then fruitful, I would never study but in my dreams; and this time also would I choose for my devotions: but our grosser memories have then so little hold of our abstracted understandings, that they forget the story, and can only relate to our awaked souls, a confused and broken tale of that that hath passed. . . . We must therefore say that there is something in us that is not in the jurisdiction of Morpheus; and that those abstracted and ecstatic souls do walk about in their own corps, as spirits with the bodies they assume, wherein they seem to hear, see, and feel, though indeed the Organs are destitute of sense, and their natures of those faculties that should inform them. Thus it is observed, that men sometimes, upon the hour of their departure, do speak and reason above themselves; for then the soul, beginning to be freed from the ligaments of the body, begins to reason like herself, and to discourse in a strain above mortality.

—SIR THOMAS BROWNE, *The Religio Medici.*

---

[23] *S. D.* I, 311.

FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS

IF the First Fundamental Proposition of Theosophy is true, then everyone and everything, perceptible or imperceptible, whether to our senses, to our memory, to our imagination, to our sensations, to our thought or to our feeling, is fundamentally and eternally one and the same unchanging Reality. The word Absolute, in itself, may be taken to mean indissoluble. Everything that can be sensed, known or perceived in any way, is, in fact, a compound, whether primary, secondary, tertiary, or in any other degree of complexity. To us these compounds appear as the "real," because we can *see* them as apart from ourselves. Whatever can be seen, or perceived in any way, is what is meant in Occultism by the word Matter. What, then, does Occultism mean by Spirit—the opposite of Matter? It can only be that Spirit is the Perceiver, and that Matter is what is perceived. (Read in these connections statements in *The Secret Doctrine* I, pp. 514 and 542.)

Spirit and Matter are not separate from each other "absolutely"—that is, in Reality. If they were absolutely separate, there could be no relation whatever between them. That which connects Spirit and Matter, or the Perceiver and what he perceives, is called *Fohat* when applied to *cosmogenesis* (*S. D.* I, 16), but when this same connection between Spirit and Matter is applied to *anthropogenesis*, Fohat becomes *Manas*—the Thinker. Man, therefore, is said to be "the microcosm of the macrocosm." Man represents the partial union of Spirit with Matter, giving rise to "individuality"—that is, self-consciousness. (See *S. D.* II, 98.)

This is but to state in another way the Third Fundamental Proposition, that individuality or self-consciousness has to be acquired by each being. Individuality in *form* is acquired by "natural impulse." This corresponds to physical gestation. "Natural impulse" means simply *induced* activity, that is, non-self-conscious activity, as illustrated in the kingdoms below man. Once the stage of "man-birth" is reached in consciousness, the being is *self*-conscious. Up to this point—during the first half of the cycle of evolution—the action of each being is part of the *mass* action, or "natural impulse," so far as each individual in the mass is concerned; but in human evolution the action of the individual is self-induced, not mass-induced.

As all objects of perception are compounds, it follows that these compounds can be dissolved. Our body is a physical compound. We

know it can be dissolved and reduced to an ultimate common constituent, whether we name it atoms or primordial matter. The mind is also a compound, and, therefore, it too can be dissolved or reduced into its ultimate constituents—what we call ideas. But all ideas spring from a common basis of perception; hence, all ideas can also be dissolved and reduced to their common basis, which is the result of the activity of one or another of the seven "principles" in nature and in man. Once more, these seven principles can themselves be reduced to one common Principle, in which they originate, in which they exist and are active, and of which activity the whole universe is the product. It is the *one* Principle, then, that is to be understood by the word Absolute. At the end of any period of manifestation, everything returns to the Absolute state or "condition," and again, at the dawn of a new evolution, everything comes forth once more into manifestation. (Read in this connection in *S. D.* I, from the bottom of page 267 to the end of page 268.)

The foregoing suggests that manifestation depends upon duality, and it is this duality which is considered by the Second Fundamental Proposition. A term useful in endeavoring to understand the Second Fundamental is the word "polarity." Spirit is *self*-polarized. This is to say that every self-conscious being has the power of choice. He can act, or abstain from acting, at will. He can choose one thing, or another, at will. This is self-polarization, or *will*-action, and only man is capable of it. In all other beings, action is induced, not self-induced. This means, then, that whether we speak of self-conscious beings in the mass, saying "Spirit," as we might say "army," or speak individually of any man, as we might say "soldier," we are speaking of life that acts by *will,* is *self*-moving; but when we regard Matter, whether as a totality, or in its multiplicity of elements and forms, it is evident that Matter has no poles, that is, no *will* in the sense of *self*-conscious determination of its action. All the motions of Matter, whether in the forces of nature, as we call them, or the mineral, vegetable or animal kingdoms, or the elementals, or the devas—all this action is induced by forces from without. Put in a single phrase, Spirit is eternally capable of self-polarization; Matter is eternally capable of being polarized by Spirit. To illustrate by a single example, it is not our body which makes us move, but we who make our body move. The Greek word for "the Gods," means the *movers.* Once, however, we have entered a body, that is, have come into partial or complete union with it, then Matter, or the body, *re*-acts on Spirit with exactly that degree of intensity in which the Spirit of Man

originally acted on Matter, or the body. We call these reactions, collectively, our "Karma."

Thus, Man is the only being in the universe who is, or may become, *consciously* the Absolute, or the relative; the unconditioned, or the conditioned, as his *will* determines. Man is the conscious embodiment of all Three Fundamentals. All other beings, all other forms of life, are *un*conscious embodiments of the same Fundamentals. The object of evolution, then, is to reach to full *self*-consciousness, and the process is the self-polarization, or *will* action of the individual man in the service of humanity and of the whole of nature.

Eternal Growth

Cast into this life, as it were, into an alembic, where, after a previous existence which we have forgotten, we are condemned to be remade, renewed, tempered by suffering, by strife, by passion, by doubt, by disease, by death. All these evils we endure for our good, for our purification, and, so to speak, to make us perfect. From age to age, from race to race, we accomplish a tardy progress, tardy but certain, an advance of which, in spite of all the skeptics say, the proofs are manifest. If all the imperfections of our being and all the woes of our estate drive at discouraging and terrifying us, on the other hand, all the more noble faculties, which have been bestowed on us that we might seek after perfection, do make for our salvation, and deliver us from fear, misery and even death. Yea, a divine instinct that always grows in light and strength helps us to comprehend that nothing in the whole world wholly dies and that we only vanish from the things that lie about us in our earthly life, to reappear among conditions more favorable to our eternal growth in good.

—George Sand.

THE QUESTION OF ATLANTIS

WITH the usual good-natured condescension shown by popular science writers for all beliefs based on "myth" and "tradition," Albert G. Ingalls discusses the lost continent of Atlantis in the leading editorial of the October *Scientific American.* He concedes there may be some grains of truth in Plato's story, for science has long admitted the reality of the "Atlantic Ridge"—"a vast submerged plateau which some Atlantean believers identify with the Lost Atlantis." The present renewal of scientific interest in the theory of Atlantis has come with the discovery of large submarine canyons far below sea-level. Surveys employing the sonic depth finder have revealed "a thing that makes geologists raise their eyebrows—a complex pattern of typical land-surface, stream-erosion channels." Mr. Ingalls asks: How extensive is this undersea land structure? Only a careful mapping of the sea-bottom in the region of the lost continent can tell. Reviewing the proposal by Captain Gilbert T. Rude, of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, that such a study of the Atlantic Ridge be made, Mr. Ingalls observes:

> If a typical pattern of stream-erosion channels—in other words, valleys—were found covering the Ridge area, this would tend to favor the Atlantis hypothesis. If only typically smooth, unchanneled seabed topography were shown, Atlantis would look still more like pure myth than it already does to most scientists.
>
> However, even if the eroded land-forms were found, the real essentials of the Atlantis hypothesis, as its mystical proponents prefer to have them—that is, the great "empire" and the civilization "superior" to those of our own times and all that kind of thing which mystics and occultists dearly love—would scarcely be given encouragement; unless perchance the dredges of the Survey were to haul up from over one mile beneath the surface a golden throne and some things we benighted moderns could not yet understand, perhaps an atomic energy machine.

Mr. Ingalls seems to think that a fine show of scientific "humor" is sufficient to dispose of all the other than geological evidence of the continent of Atlantis—the close similarity of culture and language among the primitive and ancient peoples on both sides of the Atlantic. No doubt some of the attempted "proofs" of the existence of Atlantis are visionary, just as the history of science teems with like illustrations of wishful thinking; but beneath all Atlantean speculation there is a solid substratum of undeniable *fact.* No scientific writer can conscientiously ignore the ethnological testimony to the common origin of races which lived in both hemispheres; nor should he make super-

cilious jokes about golden thrones while neglecting to mention the many detailed analogies between the arts and religious beliefs of ancient peoples bordering the Atlantic on East and West. Why should Mr. Ingalls, like so many others, throw his impartiality to the winds in regarding an "occult" idea? Do facts dissolve whenever they happen to coincide with mystical tradition?

There are, however, extenuating circumstances. The offense of this writer belongs rather to his time and profession than to him personally. The idea of a glorious civilization that has sunk beneath the Atlantic violates everything that the modern scientist has been taught to believe. It contradicts virtually every popular doctrine of cultural anthropology and contains grave implications for the biological theory of evolution as presently conceived. It is, moreover, handicapped by the support of the unorthodox, the "peculiar" and the "queer" people who have the temerity to question the generally received truths of modern knowledge. In short, serious consideration of an Atlantean culture is today impossible for conventional minds.

To understand the reasons for this prejudice it is necessary to leave the subject of geological evidences of Atlantis, which is the matter of chief concern in the *Scientific American* editorial, and to investigate briefly the history of the science of Ethnology. "Ethnology," according to a definition by W. H. R. Rivers, "is the study of the nature of the different groups, whether we call them nations, tribes, or what not, into which Man has come to be divided." It endeavors "to discover how it has come about that man presents his vast diversity of speech and thought and custom, and to find the explanation of the many points of similarity which constantly present themselves throughout the diversity."[1] In consideration of these objectives, it is at once plain to the theosophist that the existence of Atlantis as a great empire diffusing its culture throughout the prehistoric world is the key to almost every problem of modern ethnology. Yet this key is consistently ignored by all but a few unorthodox students of that science, not because of any "facts" that may be arrayed against it, but because it fits none of the contemporary theories. From the viewpoint of the history of science, the ethnologist who seriously adopted the theory of Atlantis, and defended it before his colleagues, would

[1] *Psychology and Politics* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1923), p. 109. Dr. Rivers, who died in 1922, was an English psychopathologist of great eminence. His interest turned to ethnology following an anthropological expedition to Torres Straits in 1898, on which he was accompanied by William McDougall, then his pupil. He is known to ethnologists chiefly for his studies of the Todas and of the Melanesian peoples. In psychology, much is owed to Dr. Rivers for his searching criticisms of Freud. The passages here quoted are from his essay, "The Aims of Ethnology."

probably suffer the same fate as Galileo. As a writer in the *Scientific Monthly* recently observed, "To the Pope and cardinals who condemned Galileo the pillars of civilization must have seemed to be collapsing"; he "threatened to knock the bottom out of the painfully won thought-structure of conservative men."[2] The scientist who developed the implications of the Atlantean hypothesis would have to question the validity, not merely of theories, but of settled scientific beliefs. He would be "anathematized" after the fashion of Mr. Ingall's ridicule, and, what is perhaps more vital, no orthodox institution would support him!

The allegiance of the modern man to everything represented as "scientific" is as blindly devoted as the faith of the true Christian of the Middle Ages. The scientist of today no more questions the assumptions of his field than the average medieval theologian questioned the cosmology sanctioned by the Church. The reason for this is rather obvious, and has been well expressed by the late Maurice C. Hall of the National Institute of Health. Scientists, he wrote, "are shaped by the same forces that establish all childhood patterns of behavior. They have the same incapacity for examining their patterns by the critical methods of science, for justifying their behavior by the demand for adequate evidence, and for sustaining their childish beliefs by the demand for sound reasoning." Would that all scientists could see themselves and their work as clearly!

> Our work as scientists [continues Dr. Hall] lacks the sparkle of originality and individual thinking because we are set and molded in youthful habits of thought. We follow patterns taught us, and slip into grooves from which we extricate ourselves with difficulty, if at all. To a great extent, our research follows some blueprint as evidently as does that of a carpenter or mechanic, and often shows as little, or even less, evidence of art of craftsmanship.[3]

The "blueprint" followed by modern ethnologists is that supplied by the theorists of Darwinian evolution. The first chapters of any general history of the human race, such as Wells' *Outline,* for instance, will illustrate. After a brief review of the fossil remains of apelike man, ending with the European *Neanderthal* type—a species which, following Henry Fairfield Osborn, he excludes from the ancestry of present man—Mr. Wells says:

> At present we can only guess where and how, through slow ages, parallel with the Neanderthal cousin, these first *true men* [the Cromagnards] arose out of some more apelike progenitor. For hun-

---

[2] Rufus Suter, "Galileo and the Modern World," *Scientific Monthly*, September, 1940.
[3] "Scientists Sometimes Tell the Truth," *Scientific Monthly*, August, 1938.

> dreds of centuries they were acquiring skill of hand and limb, and power and bulk of brain, in that still unknown environment. They were already far above the Neanderthal level of achievement and intelligence, when first they come into our ken . . . (I, 87).

"No doubt," Mr. Wells assures us, "the ancestor of *Homo sapiens* was a very similar and parallel creature to Homo Neanderthalis"! "No doubt" ethnologists would resent being told that the foundations of their science are a tissue of guesswork and assumption, but that is nevertheless the fact. There is no real evidence for even the "common ancestor" theory regarding the anthropoids and man. Prof. Le Gros Clark, writing in defense of the hypothesis that the Catarrhine and Platyrrhine monkeys, the anthropoid apes and Man were all offshoots of a primeval stem, says that because of anatomical similarities "we are entitled to *postulate* a common pithecoid ancestor *in the absence of serious evidence to the contrary.*" (Our italics.) This, in a book which specially emphasizes the deceptiveness of anatomical similarities! Prof. Clark writes confidently of "the stem which gave rise to the Catarrhine monkeys, the anthropoid apes and Man," despite his earlier admission that while "palaeontology has furnished a considerable amount of information regarding the later evolutionary radiations of the higher Primates, it has yielded *surprisingly little evidence* in regard to the actual origin of the pithecoid stock."[4] And the ancestral links between that imaginary "common stock" and *true men* are still "missing"!

The primitive Neolithic ancestors of modern Europeans appeared —whence, no scientist can say—"at most" only 12,000 years ago.[5] How, then, could there possibly have been a great civilization which existed on the lost continent of Atlantis, hundreds of thousands, or even twelve millenniums ago, as Plato maintained? The thing is impossible. Evidence which seems to suggest it *must* therefore have another explanation, or is unworthy of serious attention.

Let us return to the "origins," not of Man, but of modern ethnology. According to Dr. Rivers, the subject first began to be studied by those trained in scientific method about seventy years ago. At that time, he points out, the belief that man had come into existence by a special act of creation still dominated anthropological thought. It was traditionally believed that the earth had been populated by the dispersal of the Ten Tribes of Israel, to which common origin the similarities of culture among widely separated peoples were ascribed. The first scientific students of ethnology quite naturally assumed, as

---

[4] W. E. Le Gros Clark, *Early Forerunners of Man* (Baltimore: W. Wood & Co., 1934), pp. 273-4, 278.

[5] H. G. Wells, *op. cit.*, I, 108.

Dr. Rivers says, "that civilized man had travelled far over the world and that the similarities found in widely-separated parts of the earth are the outcome of the diffusion of features of culture from some part of the world, the special conditions of which had led to their appearance and development." Although "Creationism" was being rapidly abandoned, it was inevitable that many of its implied conclusions on the subject of the races should be retained. Separated from its Mosaic inspiration, the theory of diffusion followed by degeneration was unobjectionable, and it served as a foundation for further study. The artifacts of Biblical ethnology remain almost to this day in the nomenclature of that science: the "Semites" are the sons of Shem; the so-called "Hamitic" races inhabiting Africa were once thought to descend from Ham, Shem's brother; and the Aryan peoples were formerly designated "Japhetic," after Japhet, the third of the three sons of Noah.

Dr. Rivers describes the next step in the progress of ethnology:

> About forty years ago [1875-80] a great change took place in the opinions of those who devoted themselves to the study of human culture and society. The idea of evolution, which was then slowly forging its way into general acceptance, became an article of almost universal belief among students of anthropology; and as the result of a misunderstanding of what exactly biologists meant by evolution, they put forth the remarkable claim that, after an original dispersal, which they did not attempt to explain, the different varieties of mankind developed their cultures independently. They accepted the doctrine of the German traveller and ethnologist, Adolf Bastian, that the similarities between the beliefs and customs of different peoples are due to the uniformity of the constitution of the human mind, so that, given similar conditions of climate and conditions of life, the same modes of thought and behaviour come into existence independently, which are in no way due to the influence of one people upon another. When I began the study of ethnology twenty years ago [in 1898] this point of view had become absolutely dominant, at any rate in this country and America, and I accepted it without question. In common with others, I believed in the doctrine that similarities of thought and custom throughout the world arose through similarity of external conditions, and ignored the obvious fact that the similarities are found amidst external conditions of the most diverse kind—in islands and continents; in tropical and temperate climates; among agricultural, hunting and pastoral peoples; while, on the other hand, diversities are found within regions uniform in climate and social habit, while in many parts of the earth diversities of the most striking kind are found within only a few square miles.

This candid account of scientific fallibility shows how unproved beliefs, whether religious or scientific, may profoundly alter the interpretation of "the facts"[6] And facts, after all, are meaningless unless interpreted, *i. e.*, fitted into the structure of some belief or theory. As Darwin himself wrote, "How odd it is that anyone should not see that all observation must be for or against some view, if it is to be of any service." Regardless of the high claims of impartiality made for scientific method, the history of science shows that, *in practice,* the theory almost always determines what facts are important, and where they must be sought. The more firmly entrenched the theory, the more its authority approaches the status of a dogma with absolute power in the evaluation and rejection or acceptance of facts.[7]

The direct influence of religious belief on the development of ethnology lasted, as Dr. Rivers shows, until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when the theory of Darwinism replaced the religious teaching regarding the genesis of the races. The result was a complete re-interpretation of the facts to suit Darwin's generalization. Old "facts" lost their significance and were forgotten or ignored. Acceptability to evolutionary theory became the new criterion of relevance. No longer were all the peoples of the earth off-shoots of the lost tribes of Israel. Scientists now believed that similar cultures developed spontaneously, and evolution became as potent a worker of miracles as any Jehovah. Fortunately, men like Dr. Rivers began to call attention to certain realities that the enthusiasts of evolutionism had neglected, with the result that again the tide of interpretation turned in the opposite direction. At about 1900, in both England and Germany, new modified diffusionist theories were born proposing that "similarities of culture are due to transmission from some centre of origin." Among the discoveries leading to a revival of this view was Dr. Rivers' own contribution. He produced evidences of a former knowledge of navigation among the Peruvians, and even among island tribes of the Pacific, disproving the assertion that intercourse between the ancient Inca Empire and other lands had been impossible. "There is," he wrote, "no great difficulty in assum-

---

[6] Evolution is itself the greatest fact in human experience, yet its interpretation at the hands of scientific materialism has produced one of the most degrading doctrines ever imposed on the mind of man. The dogmatic derivation of humans from a species of anthropoids or a common apelike ancestor, and the groundless assumption that man is no more than an animal organism are in no sense essential to recognition of Evolution as a universal process in nature.

[7] It should be noted that the essential difference between a belief and a theory is subjective. Both are unproved preconceptions as to the nature of things, but whereas theories, by definition, are always held open to every conceivable criticism and attack, beliefs are sacrosanct. Darwinism, as a generalized conception of the origin of man, is a sacrosanct theory of modern science; hence, it is no longer a theory, but a belief.

ing the degeneration or even disappearance of the art of navigation among the inhabitants of the coasts of a continent." He observes:

> This special case is only one example of the neglect of the factor of degeneration in human culture. So long as students were under the influence of the idea of special creation, degeneration was the chief agency by which features of human culture were explained, but with the incoming of the idea of evolution this factor was thrown wholly on one side, or was used only to explain relatively unimportant facts. There was a complete failure to appreciate the vast part which degeneration is continually playing in the history of human institutions.

Today, the literally innumerable cultural evidences of the lost continent of Atlantis meet the same fate. They are "thrown wholly on one side," and then ridiculed by orthodox scientists. "Facts" can have no hearing if they are seen to call into question any of the *basic* assumptions of modern anthropology. Present diffusionist doctrines are never permitted to offend against the theories founded on Darwinian dogma, which still reigns supreme. It seems that nothing short of a psychological earthquake can disturb the foundations of this *idée fixe:* Man is an animal; civilized man is only a few thousand years old. Opposing facts are *ipso facto* pronounced false.

As a consequence, modern ethnology is almost wholly unorganized from the theoretical point of view. Its workers are lost in an uncharted sea of unrelated data. They agree on no general principles and are reduced to bare description, becoming actually afraid to propose any theory at all to their critical colleagues. The Harvard anthropologist, Clyde H. Kluckhohn, recently called attention to this ludicrous extreme of conservatism, remarking, "To suggest that something is theoretical is to suggest that it is slightly indecent."[8] He adds that "it is a form of intellectual cowardice to maintain or imply that we should stop with the accumulation of 'facts' because their interpretation is fraught with difficulties and perils." Dr. Kluckhohn's warning to anthropologists should be taken to heart by all those whose professorial prejudice leads them to discount and ignore the ethnological evidences of Atlantis. He says:

> *We must be eternally on guard against the insidious crystallization of dogma (unrealized as such) at the expense of that freshness of outlook which is surely a prerequisite to real scientific discovery.*

Since the publication of Donnelly's classic, *Atlantis: The Antediluvian World,* in 1882, the evidences of a great civilization which existed on the former Atlantic continent have been steadily increasing

[8] "The Place of Theory in Anthropological Studies," *Philosophy of Science,* July, 1939.

in number and in force. The geological proofs are undeniable and all but acknowledged today. As a single instance, the discoveries described by Pierre Termier, the French Oceanographer, in the Smithsonian Institution *Report* for 1915, may be cited. He tells of vitreous lava brought up from rocky outcrops on the bottom of the Atlantic, 1,700 fathoms deep, at a point about 500 miles north of the Azores. *Vitreous* material must have congealed in the open air! M. Termier summarizes other geological evidence showing that these lava flows, soon after having solidified in air, were suddenly submerged beneath the sea by some cataclysmic disturbance. He then adds a review of the zoological testimony assembled by Louis Germain. From a study of the fauna of the four archipelagoes, the Azores, Madeira, the Canaries, and Cape Verde, M. Germain is convinced of the former existence of an Atlantic continent connected with the Iberian Peninsula. Termier exclaims:

> How can one fail to be struck with the almost absolute agreement of these zoological conclusions with those to which geology has led us? And who could now, in the face of so complete an accord, based on arguments so different, still doubt the preservation, up to an epoch very near our own, of vast lands emerged in the part of the ocean which is west of the pillars of Hercules?

The only question remaining to be settled is whether the continent was inhabited by man. But for this, more than geological and zoological evidences are needed. These two sciences, M. Termier says, "appear to have told all that they can tell; and it is from anthropology, from ethnology, and lastly from oceanography that I am now awaiting the final answer."

A whole series of volumes could be devoted to compiling the various evidences of the great Atlantean civilization. They are scattered throughout scientific and other literature, almost never recognized as such except by the handful who refuse to submit to the prejudices of contemporary scepticism. Some few efforts have been made to summarize the facts, notably in books by Lewis Spence, and more recently in *Lost Atlantis* by James Bramwell—a scholarly review of Atlantean speculation and research, although somewhat weak in the manner of presentation. Readers of THEOSOPHY know how extensively the subject has been treated time and again in these pages. But justice could be done to the subject only through the work of many hands devoted to systematic compilation of the facts. This is properly the task of modern ethnology. How much longer will it be neglected?

THE CHRISTOS PRINCIPLE

IN his treatment of the three higher principles of man in *The Ocean of Theosophy* (p. 53), Mr. Judge states: "The English language will suffice to describe in part what *Manas* is, but not *Buddhi,* nor *Atma* and will leave many things relating to *Manas* undescribed." The writings of both H. P. B. and William Q. Judge, however, do contain extensive material designed to arouse the intuition of students as to the nature and powers of the Imperishable Triad. Among the means used to accomplish this, the Teachers have drawn upon the literature of past presentations of Theosophy, and one of the sources so used is the records of the Gnostics, both pre- and post-Christian. It is from this source that we derive the term "Christos Principle," an expression which appears to be equivalent to the three Higher principles of Man considered as a Unity. This Unity is sometimes referred to as the Seventh Principle, rather than Atma as ordinarily used. According to a footnote on page 67 of *The Key to Theosophy:*

> One often finds in Theosophical writings conflicting statements about the Christos principle in man. Some call it the sixth principle (*Buddhi*), others the seventh (*Atman*). If Christian Theosophists wish to make use of such expressions, let them be made philosophically correct by following the analogy of the old Wisdom-Religion symbols. We say that Christos is not only one of the three higher principles, but all the three regarded as a Trinity. This Trinity represents the Holy Ghost, the Father, and the Son, as it answers to abstract spirit, differentiated spirit, and embodied spirit. Krishna and Christ are philosophically the same principle under its triple aspect of manifestation.

Another passage giving this view is found in the Proem of *The Secret Doctrine* (p. 18):

> Space is called the "Mother" before its Cosmic activity, and Father-Mother at the first stage of re-awakening. In the Kabala it is also Father-Mother-Son. But whereas in the Eastern doctrine, these are the Seventh Principle of the manifested Universe, or its "Atma-Buddhi-Manas" (Spirit, Soul, Intelligence), the triad branching off and dividing into the seven cosmical and seven human principles, in the Western Kabala of the Christian mystics it is the Triad or Trinity, and with their occultists, the male-female Jehovah, Jah-Havah. In this lies the whole difference between the esoteric and the Christian trinities. The Mystics and the Philosophers, the Eastern and Western Pantheists, synthesize their pregenetic triad in the pure divine abstraction. The orthodox, anthropomorphize it.

Christendom has anthropomorphized the Christos Principle as it has the Deific Principle pervading the Universe. The Wisdom-Religion regards the Christos Principle and Deity as One in essence and to be sought forever, *within*. In her articles on the "Esoteric Character of the Gospels," H. P. B. makes it clear at the very outset that "Christ" is a principle and not a person. After quoting the precursor signs described in *Matthew*, she declares:

> Two things become evident *to all* in the above passages, now that their false rendering is corrected in the revision text: (a) "the coming of Christ," means *the presence of* CHRISTOS in a regenerated world, and not at all the actual coming in body of "Christ" Jesus; (b) this Christ is to be sought neither in the wilderness nor "in the inner chambers," nor in the sanctuary of any temple or church built by man; for Christ—the true esoteric SAVIOR—*is no man,* but the DIVINE PRINCIPLE in every human being.

The following passages from *The Ocean of Theosophy* are very probably descriptions in part of the Christos Principle:

> And when we either wholly or now and then become consciously united with *Buddhi,* the Spiritual Soul, we behold God, as it were. This is what the ancients all desired to see, but what the moderns do not believe in, the latter preferring rather to throw away their own right to be great in nature, and to worship an imaginary god made up solely of their own fancies and not very different from weak human nature (p. 58).
>
> Although reincarnation is the law of nature, the complete trinity of *Atma-Buddhi-Manas* does not yet fully incarnate in this race. They use and occupy the body by means of the entrance of *Manas,* the lowest of the three, and the other two shine upon it from above, constituting the God in Heaven. This was symbolized in the old Jewish teaching about the Heavenly Man who stands with his head in heaven and his feet in hell. That is, the head *Atma* and *Buddhi* are yet in heaven, and the feet, *Manas,* walk in hell, which is the body and physical life. For that reason man is not yet fully conscious, and reincarnations are needed to at last complete the incarnation of the whole trinity in the body. When that has been accomplished the race will have become as gods, and the godlike trinity being in full possession the entire mass of matter will be perfected and raised up for the next step. This is the real meaning of "the word made flesh." It was so grand a thing in the case of any single person, such as Jesus or Buddha, as to be looked upon as a divine incarnation. And out of this, too, comes the idea of the crucifixion, for *Manas* is thus crucified for the purpose of raising up the thief to paradise (p. 66).

From *The Secret Doctrine:*

> Note well, "Christos" with the Gnostics meant the impersonal principle, the Atman of the Universe, and the Atma within every

man's soul—not Jesus; though in the old Coptic MSS. in the British Museum "Christos" is almost constantly replaced by "Jesus." (I, 132 fn.)

The Angels *fallen into generation* are referred to metaphorically as *Serpents* and *Dragons of Wisdom.* On the other hand, regarded in the light of the LOGOS, the Christian Savior, like Krishna, whether as man or logos, may be said to have saved those who believed in the secret teachings from "eternal death," to have conquered the Kingdom of Darkness, or Hell, as every Initiate does. This in the human, terrestrial form of the Initiates, and also because the *logos* is Christos, that principle of our inner nature which develops in us into the Spiritual Ego—the Higher-Self—being formed of the indissoluble union of *Buddhi* (the sixth) and the spiritual efflorescence of *Manas,* the fifth principle (II, 230-1).

It is not correct to refer to Christ—as some theosophists do—as the sixth principle in man—*Buddhi.* The latter *per se* is a passive and latent principle, the spiritual vehicle of Atman, inseparable from the manifested Universal Soul. It is only in union and in conjunction with *Self-consciousness* that *Buddhi* becomes the Higher Self and the divine, discriminating Soul. *Christos* is the seventh principle, if anything (II, 231 fn.).

It is they [the Gnostics] who were the first to introduce and reveal to the world that which had remained concealed for ages: namely, the *Tau,* in the shape of a Procrustean bed, and Christos as incarnating in *Chrestos,* he who became for certain purposes a willing candidate for a series of tortures, mental and physical (II, 573).

The English language will not suffice to describe the higher principles of man because "descriptions" generally appeal to the intellect, while a true understanding of the higher principles is obtained by the light of these very principles themselves. The constant endeavor of the Teachers is to stimulate those soul-perceptions through which alone some realization may be had of that which is beyond the finite mind. The one and only way that the higher perceptions of man can be awakened and the Christos Principle finally realized is through the practice of the Paramitas or transcendental virtues. These Paramitas are the golden Keys to the Portals of the Occult Cosmos. They represent the ethical or highest aspects of the seven principles composing the Human Being.

Every Stoic was a Stoic; but in Christendom where is the Christian?

—EMERSON.

TRUE HAPPINESS

A REAL happiness for all men results from becoming something more than they already are. In following consciously the path of becoming, we reach a deeper understanding of other beings, learn how to help them, and thus play a larger part in furthering the evolution of all life and being. So is happiness found, for all nature rewards us through ourselves, the mirror of the whole.

In every human soul slumber all powers, natures and abilities. The qualities of the men we love and the men we hate—they are all in us, some developed but partially, some not at all. All these, both good and bad, must be understood. How can a man realize the greatness or measure the tragedy in any of the heroes and villains of history, unless he has himself arrived at the crossroads where their choices were made? Great sages are those who have noted the travelers on each fork of the road, coming to *understand,* although they may not follow, the course taken by other men.

Some men have mastered certain skills and are content to rest with them, prideful of their particular virtue, blind to the need for balance which can come only as they rise to wider ranges of action. Others feel in themselves a wealth of latent powers, are conscious of a fundamental knowledge enabling progress in all directions, and yet will not consecrate their energies to full development *in any,* unless the pressure of circumstances so demands. Neither of these two classes of men find happiness, for both in their own way have reached a standstill in the task of becoming more than they already are. The choice of going forward, or attempting to delay is before them. If they look for happiness alone, it can never be found. Real happiness wears the veil of Difficult Duty, and only the noble may find her. However much the personal man desires happiness, that goddess hides her face until the will is invoked, the task performed. Always the first step toward the goal indicated by spiritual intuition is the hardest, for the initial momentum must come from within—from *will.*

The growth of any faculty means soul development, for all faculties provide modes of action for the soul. The training of instruments of body, feeling and mind opens up the channels of soul-vision. If we are able to say: "I am now able to do that which I could not before," we have increased our power for good. If we can say: "I now feel the reality of values once beyond my scope of vision," we are truly proceeding along the path of becoming, which is the path of understanding and of real happiness. The way has been shown — the Teachers have shown it.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

HOW should a young Theosophist look at the problem of deciding upon his career? H. P. B. says that a man cannot serve two masters. Would a profession which takes most of his time be a hindrance in making Theosophy first in his life?

A problem of this character would naturally be one for individual decision, for Theosophy lays down no hard and fast rules. It sets forth general principles which serve as guides in making personal decisions.

There are several things that can and should be taken into consideration by a young theosophist in deciding upon a life career. First, of course, would be his particular nature and ability, or his fitness for a given line of endeavor. From past and present efforts in certain directions, each individual tends to be more apt in one particular field than in another, and, no doubt, there are fields in which we need a great deal more experience. It would be wise to determine where one's inclinations lie. One could contemplate a career that would afford the greatest opportunity for the development and use of innate capacities, and would also enable him to be of benefit to others. When these points have been considered, it might turn out that the career chosen would be comparatively the most congenial and give the most material returns.

A profession could be a wonderful field "for making Theosophy first in one's life." This is true of any honorable occupation. Theosophy is not worth while unless it can be made a part of everyday experiences and actions. Only then can one prove the validity of its tenets and instill similar thoughts and actions in fellow beings, and only then is Theosophy fulfilling its original purpose.

There are those who are fortunate enough to be able to make working for Theosophy their career in life. But even in such instances, it is necessary to discriminate and choose the true Theosophical course of action from temptations which lead in other directions. Any occupation which serves humanity in some respect can be made a sphere for the practice of Theosophy, and thus a sphere of beneficent influence. When the motive is one of service there is very little difference between a career which occupies most of one's time and one which is not so demanding, and in both, applications of Theosophy may be made. Mr. Crosbie went so far as to say that "Theosophy is the only thing that can be used in every direction in daily life."

Theosophists say that animals do not think and are not self-conscious. How do they know that animals do not think, or say to themselves, "I am I"?

It is necessary to establish the meaning of the word, "think," before this question can be answered. If we mean by thinking, the ability to reason, to plan and select a course of action, the animal is certainly not without these powers. Animals have been known to show forethought and judgment in choosing their prey; this is true particularly of the so-called "lowly" insect. Some insects, such as the wasp and ant, have remarkable powers of calculation in building their homes. H. P. B. says in *Transactions* (p. 13) that "in relation to its own plane of conception and perception, the ant has as good an intellect as we have ourselves, and a better one; for though it cannot express it in words, yet, over and above instinct, the ant shows very high reasoning powers, as all of us know."

But if "thinking" refers to the reflective and conscious use of the power of mind in forming images and symbols, then man is the only being capable of thought. Man has the power to live in a subjective mind-world that no animal can enter. The question is, what makes the difference?

Many accept the fact that the predominating factor in all the animal actions is instinct, recognizing that in man the chief factor is rational intelligence; but only Theosophy can supply the missing link that explains man's superior consciousness over the animal. The instinctual impulses which prompt the animal are *its* form of intelligence. One wonders sometimes if their instinct is not developed to a much greater degree than man's intelligence, in view of the perfection of some of their accomplishments. Nevertheless, man has the rational faculty by which he can govern instinctual impulses, and it is because of that factor that he *is* a man. In the animal the three principles of *Atma, Buddhi,* and *Manas* are completely latent, while in man they are active to a relative degree. With the awakening of the Manasic principle, man becomes self-conscious, *i. e.,* aware of his identity—an awareness that no animal is capable of achieving in this Manvantara.

Man has a spiritual brain in addition to the physical. He is dependent on that for perceptions of a spiritual nature. It is with the principles of Buddhi and Manas that reflective and abstract thinking can be performed. In the act of self-analysis, the highest abstract thinking, says H. P. B., "the Higher Self or Buddhi-Manas partially reveals its presence and holds the subservient brain-consciousness in review." (See THEOSOPHY XXVII, 294 fn.) No animal approaches

this state of consciousness. Through the force of Manas in action, man is enabled to formulate ideas and express them in language. The distinctive power of self-consciousness is speech; no animal has it. H. P. Blavatsky says language is coeval with reason, and could never have been developed before man became one with the informing principles of the reincarnating ego. (*S. D.* II, 199 fn.) Language is common only to beings capable of holding abstract ideas. John Dewey distinguishes between animal and human life thus: "We recognize actions as belonging to the human type by the fact that they have meaning. intent, purpose, *i. e.,* by the fact that they are preceded by and take place under control of symbolic activities and have thus 'directed quality.' " Theosophically, the greatest difference between man and animal lies in the moral responsibility that man possesses because of his unique ability to reflect on and choose a course of action, and to alter that course by his power of will.

The original three objects of the T. S. did not include Theosophy as a study. Why not?

(*a*) Today "Theosophy" is a familiar term to every educated man. The teachings known under that name have been more or less investigated by millions, while its more earnest students have accepted it as a complete and satisfactory explanation of all the problems of life. Yet, some sixty-four years ago, there was but a comparative handful of persons familiar with the word Theosophy, who knew of the teaching and the Movement which preserves and cyclicly presents it for the consideration of humanity. How then could the study of Theosophy be *directly* included as one of the objects of the T.S., when the message had not yet been presented?

The Messengers brought the message and the plan. All the obstacles that would have to be overcome before the message could be presented were known from the beginning. The first step was to find a nucleus of workers dedicated to the first object, universal brotherhood. The objects by their universal appeal served to awaken and bring into the society thoughtful men and women of all creeds and opinions who were interested in the ideals set forth.

Study of Theosophy by that name was not included in the original three objects because of the exigencies of the times. Much that passed as knowledge had to be destroyed before the Truth could be given. The objects as set forth were a method of showing sincere searchers for truth the insufficiency of our modern "wisdom" and the need for Theosophy. But the three objects do in reality define the field of Theosophical work in all ages.

(*b*) As the three objects of the Theosophical Movement appear on the inside front cover of this Magazine, it is not necessary to quote them for consideration in discussing this question. In her article, "Philosophers and Philosophicules," H. P. B. says, "Theosophy is certainly not a philosophy, simply because it includes every philosophy as every science and religion." This statement, taken in connection with the Second Object, shows that the study of Theosophy is indeed included in the declared objects of the Theosophical Society. Full consideration of the problem is given in this article, which takes up also the charge that theosophists are inconsistent in claiming to have no creed or dogmas while teaching certain very definite ideas about the nature of things. Two other articles deal with related questions: "Is Theosophy a Religion?" and "What Are the Theosophists?" In the latter, H. P. B. wrote:

> As to the transcendental side of the ancient Theosophy, it is also high time that the Theosophical Society should explain. With how much, then, of this nature-searching, God-seeking science of the ancient Aryan and Greek mystics, and of the powers of modern spiritual mediumship, does the Society agree? Our answer is:—with it all. But if asked what it believes in, the reply will be:—*"as a body*—Nothing." The Society, as a body, has no creed, as creeds are but the shells around spiritual knowledge; and Theosophy in its fruition is spiritual knowledge itself—the very essence of philosophical and theistic inquiry. Visible representative of Universal Theosophy, it can be no more sectarian than a Geographical Society, which represents universal geographical exploration without caring whether the explorers be of one creed or another (THEOSOPHY II, 456).

To this many other quotations might be added, all leading to the conclusion indicated by H. P. B.: "Above all human sects stands Theosophy in its abstract sense; Theosophy which is too wide for any of them to contain but which easily contains them all."

Theosophy is not in conflict with any form of religion, any society, any man, any opinion—however much these may be in conflict with Theosophy. What Theosophy is engaged in, through those who believe in it, as we do, without any mental reservations whatsoever, is a battle for recognition. Theosophy serves to explain the hidden side, the real and inner meaning of all things, for it is a friend to understanding, an aid to knowledge. By it a man may come to know himself through and through.—ROBERT CROSBIE.

ALAYA--THE GREAT SOUL

Alas, alas, that all men should possess Alaya, be one with the Great Soul, and that possessing it, Alaya should so little avail them!

—H. P. B., *The Voice of the Silence.*

JUDGING by outward appearances, the ordinary man quite naturally concludes that all things are separate and different. Not even two blades of grass are alike. No matter how close their resemblance to each other, no two things are identical in structure. Moreover, since all matter is constantly undergoing change, the likelihood of any beings following the same path of development seems small, if indeed possible.

Whence, then, the seeming harmony and brotherhood among all the kingdoms of nature? How is it that forms of life apparently separate and different nevertheless act as though their very existence depended on the well-being of their fellow creatures? Animals cannot exist without earth to walk upon, air to breathe, plants to live among and eat; plants cannot exist without the mineral kingdom and the fiery sun; human beings depend on all the kingdoms. A small disturbance in the balance of nature can bring hordes of insects to cover a great area in only a few days; the air can be made unfit to breathe, or the climate can change so as to destroy plant and animal life.

A similar natural balance exists between the life of thinking man here, and his life in other realms beyond the physical—realms which bind all men together by ties invisible to us on this plane. Moreover, those realms must be far more real and lasting than this one, since the seeming separateness here does not explain the laws of life. But even the invisible ties, of an electric and magnetic nature, must have their root in something higher. The Many must come from the One, striving ever to act as the One in spite of outward differences.

By the laws of analogy, the microcosmic man must be a miniature of a greater man. The whole of humanity is as one man, each individual making and sharing the karma of the whole. All beings in all worlds make a still larger unity. The tiniest vibrations set up by each individual are felt throughout the whole universe. From this point of view, the Universal Man, or Oversoul, sustains and supports all lesser souls. From It emanate all worlds and systems of worlds, all creatures and beings of every conceivable grade. Every soul is verily one with Alaya, the Oversoul; yet, as H. P. B. remarks, "Alas,

that so few men should profit by the gift, the priceless boon of learning truth, the right perception of existing things, the knowledge of the non-existent!" It is thus that Alaya "fails to reach the heart of all."

How can the Realization of this Truth, of the identity of the Many within the One, be attained? It can come only by seeking within for the answer, by opening our hearts, by learning to discern "the ever-fleeting from the everlasting." Looking without leads only to confusion in a maze of particulars. Many have been the men of great intellect caught in this maze, unable to find their way because they failed to free their hearts of selfishness. Once the heart is made pure, the mind can be cleared of all its useless lumber. Ignorance consists in false ideas, all springing from a false idea of self. Once this is cleared away, the path of learning becomes unobstructed. But before Alaya can reach the heart, pride must go. A subtle pride can throw back great beings on the brink of Realization. Any preference for the individual self to the Self of All prevents mergence with that Self. Liberation results from devotion through action dedicated to the Self, which in its soul aspect is Alaya.

After liberation must come renunciation for all souls who would keep their acquired divinity. By giving up reward, it becomes possible for others in future ages to do likewise. Without those who renounce Nirvanic bliss, this universe would be a cosmic failure. Greatest of all souls are Those who live for the sake of others, for "suffering fellow men."

The Oversoul

The Supreme Critic on the errors of the past and the present, and the only prophet of that which must be, is that great nature in which we rest, as the earth lies in the soft arms of the atmosphere; that Unity, that Over-soul, within which every man's particular being is contained and made one with all other; that common heart, of which all sincere conversation is the worship, to which all right action is submission; that overpowering reality which confutes our tricks and talents, and constrains every one to pass for what he is, and to speak from his character and not from the tongue, and which evermore tends to pass into our thought and hand, and become wisdom, and virtue, and power, and beauty.

—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

ETHICS OF COMMUNICATION

IN the mere conventional forms required by good breeding among any given people, is there anything at all to indicate that a spiritual conception underlies them? Many forms are a parody of true courtesy, while at times a trivial infringement against the customary will bring a rude or cruel reprisal. When Theosophy was brought to the Western World, one of the prejudices against it was that it came from the "uncivilized" East—from those who had different customs from ours and to whom very different ideas were important.

While Theosophy, as a matter of fact, did not come from the modern East, geography is neither a determinant of nor a barrier to Truth. Besides making this clear, H. P. B. fought to release the mind of men from two prejudices: first, that science and truth are "modern" products, and that nothing can be learned from the far past; second, the idea that civilization refers alone to the lands of Europe, inhabited by "barbarians" not so many centuries past. Montesquieu made a like attempt in his *Persian Letters*. France was outraged to find the educated "manners" of elegant Frenchmen the object of raillery by "outlandish" Persians. How filthy, crude, and boorish the Parisian seemed to the Persian!

The shaking of hands, the forms of introduction, the opening and closing forms of a letter differ in each country, and such simple variance of custom may cause even disaster to some person's fortune. The more travelled, or the more tolerant a person is, however, the less such forms matter. During the World War the queen of a small European country found herself without a retinue. She walked to a village store and purchased a broom. This she tucked under her arm, and proceeded to walk home. A broom and a queen did not seem at all extraordinary or incompatible. As she stopped to speak to her subjects that lovely spring morning, she impressed all who heard her gracious and friendly speech with her queenliness, in which even the broom participated.

A truly great person is never bound by customs as such. They are the mere lubrication of intercourse, the machinery of ethics. So, the German gentleman, who in his own country must always speak first to his lady acquaintance whom he meets by chance, will be just as truly distinguished for what he is, in America, although he continue his own custom of speaking first, which there is "against the rules."

Wherever we find an enlightened, harmonious, and progressive society or assembly of persons—a group whose influence promotes justice, charity, and good-will—it is possible to note a very definite technique applied in the handling of the most trivial occurrences on up to the most important. Although practically every rule of the book on etiquette may and even should on occasion be broken, there are two principles which are never ignored. They have to do with what one might term the "ethics of communication," and are the reins which guide conversation into constructive channels, out of the realm of the merely amusing, or of the merely random time-killing. First it is presumed that all those present are well-disposed—that they desire and will concur in any ideas shown to be for the welfare of men in general. Nor are we referring to religious or philosophical groups, where this certainly should be the case, but only to those social groups which by long association and happy tradition have evolved for themselves a kind of *"esprit de corps."* It is this subtle spirit of good humor and good intention that gives to certain gatherings a perfume of kindliness and mutual respect. Second, in such gatherings distinctions of race, creed, sex, condition, or organization are sedulously avoided, except as deliberately touched upon to further friendly and appreciative understanding. This is mere instinct with those who pass the tradition from one generation of gentle manner to another. When a mixed and cosmopolitan gathering becomes a unified, integrated society, a *whole,* so to say, it is this rule, based on the first, which brings forth the happy blend.

Does Theosophy place any importance on so trifling a matter as etiquette? Considering that no action in which we are associated with other human beings but may become a source of spiritual harmony, the Teachers have left endless hints for a man to follow in his daily encounters. In fact, application to daily life is the first step in understanding the fundamental Truths of Theosophy. Theosophically, we know that gossip—talking about persons, and personal events—may lead to mischief. We have the feeling, too, that "he of little speech" is wise indeed. So, if we must talk, we may at least choose what to talk about. We may study this as calmly and dispassionately as bookkeeping, trying to learn this art as we do any other, by attention to the ABC "Do's" and the ABC "Dont's."

A worthwhile "Do" is to stress large, impersonal issues. The best "Don't" is not to gossip about your own personal affairs or another's. Gossip narrows the spiritual horizon, does not lead to brotherly understanding or wisdom. Theosophy seeks to dispel man's ignorance. So long as its antidote of wisdom stays *in* the books, and *out* of our

heads and hearts, we remain "ignorant." While ignorance is the cause of all men's woes, it is pathetic shallowness of thought, the paucity of ordinary information, and the misinformation, which cause well-intentioned bodies to be disrupted by bad feeling. If we knew anything at all about man's history, and if we thought more about the general problems, aims and ends of humanity, we would not narrow our view to the mere personal wrappings of things—our trips to the dentist, the baker, the shoemaker; the number of "formals" for Flora; or the way "the boss" treats Bill; the next movie we want to see. These things cannot be avoided as matters for momentary decision, and passing comment, but to reduce our communion with other souls exclusively to constant rehearsals of the day's deeds is a deadly process.

The earnest study of such books as *The Secret Doctrine, Isis Unveiled, The Key to Theosophy, The Ocean of Theosophy,* will help make one an agent for brotherhood, for the reconciliation of the differences by which every man is hemmed about. There is no occupation, no creed, no race, no condition, which cannot be better understood by the study of these works. Ignorance alone makes us proud that we are English, German, Irish, French, American; that our family dates back to King Dagobert; that the family tree shows talent, title, or money. Ignorance alone separates rich and poor, Indian and white man, popular and unpopular, favored and unfavored.

All offenses are committed against the lower personality. We ignorantly or foolishly slander the occupation, the habits, the conduct, the race or creed of another. If we stayed on higher ground—*away from the personal*—none of these offenses would arise. Jesus is recorded by one of his apostles to have said; "In this world offenses must come, but woe to him through whom the offense cometh." Deprecatory reference to any nation or people will never mend the unbrotherly spirit which divides race from race. Consideration of the general subject of racial intolerance, on the other hand, may help to press down our hampering prejudices and lead to an understanding of the problems of others, because we can only discuss such a subject with justice when we are informed. The entire Theosophic literature gives us just such information as is best calculated to show that no nation and no individual are so much better or so much worse than any other that final judgments may be made. We can certainly see good and bad side by side wherever we look in the affairs of man. It is the part of wisdom, discretion, and learning to use the principle of separating the good from the evil *act—not the good from the evil nation or person.*

If we regard our presence with some other being as an opportunity for learning, as a chance to add to the impulse of the upward swing of mankind, we will strike a general, an *impersonal* note in our conversation. A general subject permits the mind to work creatively, travelling quickly over all past experiences and thought, picking out the relevant, the correlative details in connection with the general proposition. Here, it is never necessary to name a name or disclose a confidence. The object is to reach some universal conclusion or accord, using principle as a divining rod in the field of experience. When we keep in the personal field we cause our listener to take a passive role. He cannot verify from his experience the mere incidents of our narration. If we finally pause to catch a breath, and he starts in on *his* monologue, then we assume a passive role. Participation, in creation, in true learning, is *active*. Let us think on the greater issues of man and encourage all minds to work together in a liberalizing, impersonal way.

Etiquette should be the ethical, courteous, harmonious method of communication—the way that facilitates our work in co-operation with other human beings—that we may cross over the barriers and boundaries of special caste and increase our understanding and compassion for all other men. The whole structure of society rests upon communication; speech, writing, music, all the arts, are simply means of reaching the mind of another. The architect and engineer use blue-prints to further their purposes. Every act involving another being involves some form of communication, if not in writing, then in facial expression, gesture, or word. Our communications will have their best effect if we do not involve them in personal preference or dislike.

Good Discourse

Conversation presupposes a common sympathy in the subject, a great equality in the speakers; absence of egotism, a tender criticism of what is spoken. Good discourse wins from the bashful and discreet what they have to speak, but would not, without this provocation. The forbidding faces are Fates to overbear and blemish true fellowship. We give what we are, not necessarily what we know; nothing more, nothing less, and only to our kind; those playing best their parts who have the nimblest wits, taking out the egotism, the nonsense, putting wisdom, information in their place.

—Bronson Alcott.

ON THE LOOKOUT

1300 "Geniuses"

In *Science* for Oct. 4, Prof. Lewis M. Terman, an American psychologist who has devoted most of his professional career to the problem of genius, describes some of the results of an investigation he has been conducting for the past eighteen years. His studies of 1300 California school children lead him to the conclusion that "the intellectually gifted individual can be identified almost as accurately in the third elementary grade as at age 30." These children were selected in 1922 from a school population of about a quarter of a million. They represent the five or six in a thousand who were capable of earning IQ scores of 140 or better. Periodically, Prof. Terman retested these subjects as they matured, keeping close watch over their development. He is still in contact with 95 per cent of the original group. A study of those who have already accomplished much in their chosen profession or career revealed that the direction of these future achievements was foreshadowed by marked talents and capacities recorded eighteen years ago. Why, then, did not *all* these promising children develop their possibilities to the same extent?

"Non-Intellectual" Factors

Attempting to answer this question, Prof. Terman made a special comparison of two groups of his subjects—the most successful with the least successful among 600 of his gifted individuals. ("Success" was determined by the practical use of intellectual abilities, earned income being regarded as unimportant.) The members of both these groups, in maturity as in childhood, scored almost equally in IQ tests, causing Prof. Terman to observe that "the differences in success must necessarily be due chiefly to non-intellectual factors." Despite their equal intellectual powers, the members of the least successful group began in high school to obtain lower grades, and in college the slump became alarming. Prof. Terman offers evidence showing that the successful subjects enjoyed better home environments and exhibited a higher degree of emotional stability, but is far from suggesting that these factors are alone sufficient to account for differences in achievement among persons whose native capacities have remained relatively the same from 1922 to 1940. He fails, however, to suggest that the *will* may have anything to do with success. Reference to the will

would probably be "too metaphysical" for a professor of modern psychologic science. And the idea that reincarnation might account for talents which manifest in early life would be even less acceptable. So long as psychology prefers mysteries to metaphysics, it will have mysteries, heaped up, pressed down, and running over.

Artificial Genius

Nor does Prof. Terman's article really relate to the question of true genius, despite its title, "Psychological Approaches to the Biography of Genius." He has been dealing rather with a group of persons with remarkable intellectual facility, as singled out by a method of testing which must of necessity neglect qualities which are far more important to actual greatness. A suspicion that this is the case seems to have occurred to the professor, for he records the doubt that any of his subjects will a hundred years hence be found among "the thousand most eminent persons of history." He nevertheless adopts Samuel Johnson's definition of a genius, "as one who is endowed with superior intellectual ability," and allows this assumption to color all his judgments.

From the Theosophical viewpoint, the identification of superior intellectual ability with genius misses entirely the distinction between what H. P. Blavatsky described as "the true and the artificial genius, one born from the light of the immortal Ego, the other from the evanescent will-o'-the-wisp of the terrestrial or purely human intellect and the animal soul." Artificial genius, she says, is the outcome of culture and purely intellectual acuteness. This approximates Prof. Terman's criterion. "The *sine qua non* of genius," he says, "is the ability to acquire and to manipulate concepts, the shorthand symbols without which abstract thinking can not proceed." He specifically rejects the idea that genius is a "mystical gift" that cannot be explained by the ordinary laws of human nature, thus showing how truly H. P. B. characterized the present as a *barren period* in history, when "the spiritual sight of the majority of mankind is so blinded as to lose every notion of the superior powers of its own divine spirit." (*S. D.* II, 74.)

Genius, Theosophically Defined

The real genius, Theosophy teaches, is one "who never loses sight, even when in the depths of matter, of that guiding Divine Soul and mind, or what we call *Buddhi-Manas*." Of those who hold that genius is simply a matter of cultivation of the intellect, H. P. B. wrote:

> It is useless to argue with such, or tell them that original and great genius puts out the most dazzling rays of human intellectuality, as the sun quenches the flame-light of a fire in an open field; that it is never eccentric; though always *sui generis*; and that no man endowed with true genius can ever give way to his physical animal passions. In the view of an humble Occultist, only such a grand altruistic character as that of Buddha or Jesus, and of their few close imitators, can be regarded, in our historical cycle, as fully developed GENIUS (THEOSOPHY III, 393).

In a note in *The Voice of the Silence,* H. P. B. says that "Genius is without exception a talent or aptitude brought from another birth," and in the article quoted above she says that "the cultivation of certain aptitudes throughout a long series of past incarnations must finally culminate in some one life, in a blooming forth as *genius,* in one or another direction." This explanation may be applied to men of towering greatness in some special field, such as Shakespeare, Newton, and a few others, in contrast to the *fully developed* geniuses who are Adepts.

GENIUS AND MADNESS

Lombroso thought that genius is a symptom of hereditary degeneration, "allied to moral insanity," and, according to Nisbet, "as a rule, the greater the genius the greater the unsoundness." Prof. Terman speaks of the more recent Lange-Eichbaum theory that "great achievement is associated with emotional tensions which border on the abnormal." The genius is psychopathic, asserts Prof. David Henderson, psychiatrist of Royal Edinburgh Hospital for Mental Disease (New York *Times,* April 20, 1940). Here, again, it is plain that these opinions are all founded on study of geniuses of the "artificial" kind. Writes H. P. B.:

> Born out of the chaos of terrestrial sensations, of perceptive and retentive faculties, yet of finite memory, it will ever remain the slave of its body; and that body, owing to its unreliability and the natural tendency of matter to confusion, will not fail to lead even the greatest *genius,* so called, back into its own primordial element, which is chaos again, or *evil* or earth. . . . Like the good and bad genii of old with whom human genius is made so appropriately to share the name, it takes its helpless possessor by the hand and leads him, one day to pinnacles of fame, fortune and glory, but to plunge him on the following day into an abyss of shame, despair, often of crime.

Still another explanation of the unbalanced character of many historical "geniuses" is provided in H. P. B.'s article, "Chelaship

and Mediumship." Persons with mediumistic tendencies may on occasion be capable of extraordinary heights of human expression, and at other times fall prey to the most degrading influences. In *Isis Unveiled* it is stated that "the intellectual perception of the astral entity is proportionately as much higher than the corporeal intelligence of the medium in its normal state, as the spirit entity is higher than itself." (II, 596.) Ignorant of both the astral and spiritual aspects of the human being, it is not surprising that psychiatrists have come to regard the exotic productions of psychic inspiration as evidence of abnormality, identifying genius with mental disorders verging on insanity.

Rarity of Greatness

In justice to Prof. Terman, it should be said that he suspects that the "factors which make for ordinary achievement under ordinary conditions are different from those which make for eminence of a superlative order," that "beyond a certain high level of intellectual ability success is largely determined by non-intellectual factors and that the number of persons who are endowed with abilities equal to great achievement is immensely greater than the number who will attain eminence." He ends by speaking of the

> larger truth that no one can doubt who has studied either a group of historical persons or a group of living gifted subjects; namely, that genius and eminence are far from perfectly correlated. Why they are so poorly correlated, what circumstances affect the fruition of human talent, are questions of such transcendent importance that they should be investigated by every method that promises the slightest reduction of our present ignorance. So little do we know about our available supply of potential genius; the environmental factors that favor or hinder its expression; the emotional compulsions that give it dynamic quality; or the personality distortions that make it dangerous! And viewing the present crisis in world affairs who can doubt that these things may decide the fate of a civilization?

One method of investigation psychologists might adopt is the study of the Theosophical philosophy. There they would find no oversimplified generalizations, no dogmas which exclude exceptional facts, but a systematic approach to *all* phenomena of human achievement in terms of the various principles or bases of action within the human being. Theosophy teaches "the presence in man of *various* creative powers—called genius in their collectivity." It is all too clear from Prof. Terman's article that modern psychology knows nothing of the real nature of these powers.

WHITE INDIANS!

Dispatched by Henry Ford and Harvey Firestone to locate new sources of crude rubber, Richard O. Marsh, consulting engineer and junior partner of Gen. G. W. Goethals of Panama Canal fame, arrived in Panama in 1923 in search of possible sites for rubber plantations. The commercial aspect of his journey, however, was soon subordinated to a series of exciting adventures among the Indians of Darien, in which he played the various parts of physician, "secretary of state," plenipotentiary, and finally military adviser in a successful revolution! But most remarkable of all of Mr. Marsh's experiences was his discovery of *white Indians*—as he says, "The one tale of Latin America in which no respectable explorer dares to believe!"

THE FIRST MAYANS?

Sailing along the coast, he happened to notice that a chain of mountains along the east coast of Darien, below the Canal Zone, had been misplaced by thirty miles on his map. He investigated further and found that the mountains hid an unknown valley watered by the Chucunaque river, where lives a tribe of Indians called the Tule People. They were later identified by Ales Hrdlicka, Smithsonian Institution anthropologist, as "a practically pure-blooded remnant of the ancient first dynasty of Mayas and also related anthropologically to the early coastal cultures of Peru, the Yuncas and the Chimu." As the only known living examples of these ancient races, which were overwhelmed and amalgamated by later conquering peoples, the discovery of the Tules is of great scientific importance. They form a genuine nation, although a small one, homogeneous in blood and in culture. It was among the Tules that Mr. Marsh discovered a number of *blond* Indians, with yellow hair and blue or hazel eyes. These white natives are always born of brown parents, for a tabu forbids marriage among themselves. Some scientists have tried to explain this biological mystery by calling the white Indians "mutations," while others suppose that they are atavistic descendants of a primeval white race that mingled with the Tule people in ancient times. This latter hypothesis is the more likely. As Mr. Marsh makes clear in his book, *White Indians of Darien* (Putnam, 1934), the blond Tules are not albinos. True albinos are always characterized by hair and skin, not simply blond, but wholly devoid of pigment, and have pink eyes.

Tule Language Aryan!

A number of the Tule Indians were brought to the United States to give scientists an opportunity to make detailed studies of their ethnology and language. Mr. Marsh summarizes the findings of linguistic experts:

> A vocabulary of six thousand Tule words was developed. Their language was recorded on dictaphone records. A system of phonetic writing was devised, and a thorough analysis made of it. Finally the linguists came to me and reported, "The anthropologists can tell you what they please, Marsh, but some ancient Norse people certainly taught the Tule People their language." They found that the Tule language had a Sanskrit or Aryan structure, not *mongoloid,* and they discovered over sixty words identical with early Norse.

The origin of the Mayan Indians is a mystery to ethnology. Their art has been correlated with the art of the Egyptians, with Buddhist temples in Java, with the costume of the Guanches of the Canary Islands. According to Madame Blavatsky, the great stone buildings of Palenque, Copan and Arica were probably built by the Atlanteans (*Isis* I, 545). But as a race, the Mayans, she says, while coeval with Plato's Atlantis, belonged to the Aryan fifth continent. (*S. D.* II, 35). This statement is borne out by the linguistic studies of the Tules.

Atlantean Colonists

Undoubtedly, the Americas became the refuge of Atlantean peoples of all types. Inland South America is a literal *pot pourri* of declining races, most of them remnants of tribes and families of the Atlantean stock which fell gradually into an abject and savage condition (*S. D.* II, 744). The English explorer, William McGovern, found markedly differing types even among South American Indians regarded as pure-blooded. (*Jungle Paths and Inca Ruins,* p. 68.) The evidences of Negro influence in Mayan art are well known, and mongoloid types seems almost haphazardly distributed throughout these southern lands. McGovern, for instance, says that the natives of South America have much more in common with the Mongolians than the North American Indians, a fact somewhat damaging to the theory that South America was populated by tribes which crossed the Bering Strait, migrating down the western coast of North America and then over the Isthmus of Panama. He also speaks of "perpetually recurring tales" of white Indians and refers to "a few white faces seen in the depths of the forest." (*Jungle Paths and*

Inca Ruins, p. 139.) Perhaps now that the Darien white Indians have been scientifically authenticated, these tales will meet with less scepticism. Donnelly called attention to the *blue, gray* and *hazel* eyes of the North American Mandan Indians, whose traditions give a clear account of the sinking of Atlantis (*Atlantis,* p. 110). And Spaniards in search of the Seven Cities of Cibola in the American Southwest reported meeting with white savage chiefs (*S. D.* II, 744).

MAYAN CALENDAR

The best evidence of the antiquity of the Mayan race is its calendar, which reveals an astonishing knowledge of astronomy. According to Matthew W. Sterling, leader of the National Geographic-Smithsonian archaeological expedition to the states of Veracruz and Tabasco in Mexico, the Mayas started their calendar with a date about five thousand years ago, which time, he says, "must have marked some event of tremendous significance to them in their mythological history." (*National Geographic*, August, 1939.) But why "mythological"? Five thousand years ago marked the beginning of the Dark Age, or Kali Yuga, and to the theosophist it seems quite natural and "scientific" to date all subsequent events from that time.

Mr. Sterling describes the discovery at Tres Zapotes (Veracruz) of a slab of stone "bearing the earliest data yet discovered in the western hemisphere." If Dr. Herbert Spinden's method of calculation is correct, this date is Nov. 4, 291 B. C. Carved in delicate Maya symbols, the stone was found in an archaeological zone extending two miles over an area once occupied by a large aboriginal city. The first of the great stone heads recently unearthed in that general locale was also discovered at Tres Zapotes. Measuring six feet high and eighteen feet in circumference, this ten-ton basalt monument had been carved from a single block of stone transported from a quarry more than ten miles away. Says Mr. Sterling:

> This problem, which would tax the ingenuity of an engineer with the benefit of modern machinery, included crossing the 30-foot-deep gorge of the arroyo. The ancient engineers, however, performed the feat successfully, quarrying a flawless block of basalt and transporting it in perfect condition without the aid of the wheel or domestic animals.

BASIC MAYAN CULTURE

More recently several other colossal heads were found at La Venta in the adjacent state of Tabasco. The largest was eight and a half feet high and twenty-two feet in circumference. In this case the

basalt blocks were transported at least 50 miles. (See Lookout for October, where a quotation from *Science* gives twice this distance.) Three of these heads are pictured in the September, 1940, *Geographic,* illustrating another article by Mr. Sterling. Their round countenances bear a startling resemblance to the white Indians discovered by Mr. Marsh in Darien. (Compare photographs on pages 310, 315, and 331 of the September *Geographic* with a picture at page 126 of Marsh's book.) And, as might be expected, the artists who carved the heads are likewise believed to have been early Mayans. Mr. Sterling names them the *Olmecs,* "whose origin," he says, "is as yet very little known," but who may have constituted "the basic civilization out of which developed such high art centers as those of the Maya, Zapotecs, Toltecs, and Totonacs." The Tres Zapotes and La Venta finds extend the area of the known limits of Mayan culture by about 150 miles.

Mayan Artistry

While many of the Olmec sculptures are definitely negroid in character, the head of one small clay figure might represent a character from Faust. It has a high and narrow nose, with pointed beard and almond-shaped eyes, and is credited with being "one of the best examples of ceramic art yet found in the new world." Scores of delicately carved stelae (stone slabs bearing inscriptions or designs) testify to the highly developed and cosmopolitan stage of the Olmec culture, which is admitted to have existed several centuries B. C., lasting almost until the Spanish conquest. The abandonment of their ancient cities by the Olmecs is as mysterious as their origin.

"What Is Social Science?"

Prof. Edwin B. Wilson of Harvard, writing to answer this question in *Science* for Aug. 23, arrives at the depressing conclusion "that there is not much that is social science." He starts out by quoting Ruskin's definition of Science, "The Knowledge of things, whether Ideal or Substantial," then looking about for some *social* science. As one who has achieved some note in this field, Prof. Wilson is entitled to render judgment. He says:

> If we use science in the strict sense of knowledge systematized and coordinated and generally accepted by professionally competent persons we have, I fear, to admit that there is very little social science. Many a time I have sat at the Social Science Research

Council or at committee meetings at Harvard or elsewhere, when in groups of social scientists the conversation has turned to questions of their science. Under such circumstances one generally listens to disputes between different opinions which those participating hold and try to substantiate, each against the others, by appeal to reason and argument rather than by appeal to facts.

CONSPICUOUS ABSENCE OF FACTS

A natural question, Prof. Wilson suggests, is "What *are* the facts of Social Science?" and the reply, he tells us, is "something vague," such as—

> "There is a great body of economic science on which all or most economists are in agreement as is true of physics." When, however, one gets down to brass tacks and presses for something agreed upon from out of this great body of economic knowledge, one finds hesitancy; and if by an excess of daring some member of the group ventures some definite proposition as known, his confrères cry out that they do not agree. Statistically speaking, I have seen this sort of thing happen often enough under serious circumstances and have seen the contrary, namely, the successful specification of scientific knowledge, occur so infrequently that I am led to my inference that there is not much that is social science. There are, to be sure, as always, possible avenues of escape from such a particular inference; one might, for example, conclude that the social scientist is simply not interested in whatever it is that is known.

THE "LITERARY" APPROACH

Prof. Wilson sees as ominous the fact that some of those least inclined to study the facts are "among those most actively advocating social and economic control." These, he says, "must be prepared for serious failure to achieve ends and even for the appearance of tragedies—unless and until a social science has been developed from which the results of the experiment can be predicted with assurance." Ironically, the great men of history who have really had knowledge of true social science are those condemned by modern empiricism as visionary idealists. The principles upon which all social evolution must proceed were known to Buddha, to Plato, to Jesus and many others; these, as every adept, had turned their own lives into a "social experiment" and knew from first-hand experience what could be expected from the action they proposed. The teachings of such men, however, are classed as "literary" social science by Prof. Wilson. But he is not contemptuous of the great moralists. His

article is refreshingly free from the usual diatribes against metaphysics, even regarding favorably the speculative inquiries of the philosophers of other centuries. He examines the Yale curriculum of seventy-five years ago for elements of what we now name "social" science, finding in the senior year such subjects as History and Political Philosophy, Political Economy, Moral Philosophy and Theology. Among the philosophical and theological texts used were Hamilton's *Metaphysics,* Stewart's *Active and Moral Powers,* Butler's *Sermons* and *Analogy,* Hopkins' *Moral Science,* Paley's *Natural Theology* and *Evidences of Christianity.*

A Philosophical Foundation

He comments:

> The point which I would make is that the social and moral sciences or philosophies were apparently treated along with theology as comparable and culminating parts of a liberal education. There is little likelihood that the scientific aspects of any of them were emphasized but the maturity and caliber of the men who gave them and the high standards of the texts which were used is adequate evidence that they were a good liberal education. . . . That those of our students who concentrate today in the social fields learn far more of their detail than students learned seventy-five years ago seems certain, but it seems equally certain that those who concentrate in other fields by the very intensity of their concentration may have a far less philosophic outlook upon society than did all the students of those days.

Professor Wilson makes no attempt to define his view of the proper place and content of social studies in the modern college; but he does, however, say that in a field "where so little is known it would be well to consider the social sciences not as individual branches of learning but as an interest in man, reaching out even to theology as they did at Yale—for who shall assert that man lives by bread alone or that an ideology that triumphs over material conditions does not have to approach to a religion?"

The movement in modern education captained by Dr. Hutchins of Chicago University is indeed gaining strength! Here a professor of social science—a field that is a stronghold of empiricism—admits that even theology may have some value! Let us hope that the social sciences can open the door to metaphysics without admitting any of the scholastic justifications of a personal God. Agnostic empiricism, hard-headed and skeptical, is preferable by far to the high-toned sacerdotalism and cultured piety that would inevitably result from admission of Jehovah to the academic fold.

FREEDOM IS MORALITY

Now in the autumn of a long and productive life, John Dewey, for generations the leader of the progressive movement in modern education, has published the fruition of his lifetime's experience. His latest book, *Freedom and Culture,* is packed with humanitarian wisdom and sound common sense. In it the issues involving the future of America are clearly drawn. Again and again, he demonstrates the essentially *moral* character of the present crisis in civilization. The opening pages tell how Thomas Jefferson in his later years carried on a friendly philosophical correspondence with John Adams. In one of his letters Jefferson wrote:

> The advance of liberalism encourages a hope that the human mind will some day get back to the freedom it enjoyed two thousand years ago. This country, which has given to the world the example of physical liberty, owes to it that of moral emancipation also, for as yet it is but nominal with us. The inquisition of public opinion overwhelms in practice the freedom asserted by the laws in theory.

ORIGIN OF FREE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Dewey comments:

> The situation that has developed since this time may well lead us to reverse the ideas he expressed, and inquire whether political freedom can be maintained without that freedom of culture which he expected to be the final result of political freedom. It is no longer easy to entertain the hope that given political freedom as the one thing necessary all other things will in time be added to it—and so to us. For we know that the relations which exist between persons, outside of political institutions, relations of industry, of communication, of science, art and religion, affect daily associations, and thereby deeply affect the attitudes and habits expressed in government and rules of law. If it is true that the political and legal react to shape the other things, it is even more true that political institutions are an effect, not a cause.

It is evident from Mr. Dewey's discussion of such questions that he believes the moral values of human society to be primary realities. A chapter on "Science and Free Culture" reviews the scientific neglect of what he calls "moral facts":

> Historically, the position that science is devoid of moral quality has been held by theologians and their metaphysical allies. For the position unmistakably points to the necessity for recourse to some other source of moral guidance. That a similar position is now taken in the name of science is either a sign of confusion that permeates all aspects of culture, or is an omen of ill for democracy. If control of conduct

amounts to a conflict of desires with no possibility of determination of desire and purpose by scientifically warranted beliefs, then the practical alternative is competition and conflict between unintelligent forces for control of desire.

Materialism Not Final

This is the practical position of modern psychology—a complete denial of freedom of the will. Mr. Dewey does not accept it, giving his reason:

> The conclusion is so extreme as to suggest that denial in the name of science of the existence of any such things as moral facts may mark a transitional stage thoughtlessly taken to be final . . . to say that there are no such things as moral facts because desires control formulation and valuation of ends is in truth but to point to desires and interests as themselves moral facts requiring control by intelligence equipped with knowledge.

The same problem arises in the final chapter, in which Mr. Dewey considers "Democracy and America." Here the moral problem is accentuated by our technological progress.

> That more adequate knowledge of human nature is demanded if the release of physical powers is to serve human ends is undeniable. But it is a mistake to suppose that this knowledge of itself enables us to control human energies as physical science has enabled us to control physical energies. It suffer from the fallacy into which those have fallen who have supposed that physical energies put at our disposal by science are sure to produce human progress and prosperity. A more adequate science of human nature might conceivably only multiply the agencies by which some human beings manipulate other human beings for their own advantage.

Fallacies of Social Theory

Not only "might conceivably," but has already done so. What is modern propaganda but a means of manipulating the emotions of human beings? What the psychology of modern advertising? Mr. Dewey describes in his own way what theosophists term "Black Magic":

> Failure to take account of the moral phase of the problem, the question of values and ends, marks, although from the opposite pole, a relapse into the fallacy of the theorists of a century ago who assumed that "free"—that is to say, politically unrestrained—manifestation of human wants and impulses would tend to bring about social prosperity, progress, and harmony. It is a counterpart fallacy to the Marxist notion that there is an economic or "materialistic" dialectic of history by which a certain desirable (and in that sense moral) end

will be brought about with no intervention of choice of values and effort to realize them. As I wrote some years ago, "the assimilation of human science to physical science represents only another form of absolutistic logic, a kind of physical absolutism."

TRUE DEMOCRACY

Practical application of his philosophy to the contemporary scene leads Mr. Dewey to conclude:

> The conflict as it concerns the democracy to which our history commits us is *within* our own institutions and attitudes. It can be won only by extending the application of democratic methods, methods of consultation, persuasion, negotiation, communication, co-operative intelligence, in the task of making our own politics, industry, education, our culture generally, a servant and an evolving manifestation of democratic ideas. Resort to military force is a first sure sign that we are giving up the struggle for the democratic way of life, and that the Old World has conquered morally as well as geographically—succeeded in imposing upon us its ideals and methods.

ENDS AND MEANS

> If there is one conclusion to which human experience unmistakably points it is that democratic methods demand democratic means for their realization. Authoritarian methods now offer themselves to us in new guises. They come to us claiming to serve the ultimate ends of freedom and equity in a classless society. Or they recommend adoption of a totalitarian regime in order to fight totalitarianism. In whatever form they offer themselves, they owe their seductive power to their claim to serve ideal ends. Our first defense is to realize that democracy can be served only by the slow day by day adoption and contagious diffusion in every phase of our common life of methods that are identical with the ends to be reached and that recourse to monistic, wholesale, absolutist procedures is a betrayal of human freedom no matter in what guise it presents itself.

These observations form a wise treatise on the vulnerability of human nature. In the principle given, that good ends require good means, lies the pivotal doctrine of Theosophy respecting all true human progress. Its neglect explains the power of dogmatic religion over the psychic nature and minds of countless millions. To theosophists, H. P. B. wrote that "advantage is often taken of your noblest qualities to betray and mislead you." Mr. Dewey has a clear perception of this psychological fact.